DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 159 EA 027 407

AUTHOR Zuelke, Dennis C.; Nichols, Teresa M.
TITLE Collaborative School Climate Action Research for School Improvement: Part II.
PUB DATE Nov 95
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Biloxi, MS, November 8-10, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Action Research; *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Planning; *Data Analysis; Data Collection; Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Organizational Climate; *Participatory Research; Partnerships in Education; School Culture; Self Evaluation (Groups)

ABSTRACT

Recent calls for collaborative efforts appear to be aimed at universities doing a better job at supporting school-improvement efforts. This paper describes outcomes of a project in which university faculty supported and trained local administrators and teachers at one school in the use of collaborative action research to improve teaching and learning conditions. The project developed in response to a small city high school's need to improve relations among parents, teachers, and 750 students. Two educational administration professors worked with school administrators and staff in an action-research project to collect, analyze, and utilize data for school improvement. Surveys were completed by 378 students, 265 parents, and 43 teachers. Focus-group interviews were also conducted with teachers and students. The five-step action-research process was comprised of problem formulation, data collection, data analysis, information dissemination, and action planning for school improvement. The paper focuses on the last two stages, particularly on problems encountered in developing a school action plan. In the end, the school staff's report ignored perceptual differences among the school groups, using the research to create a favorable impression to a visiting committee. The experience illustrates how local control of the collaborative action-research process and data interpretation can be manipulated by the local school staff. The appendix contains a focus group worksheet. (Contains 24 references.) (LMI)

COLLABORATIVE SCHOOL CLIMATE ACTION RESEARCH FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT: PART II

by

Dennis C. Zuelke, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
College of Education
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, AL 36265

and

Teresa M. Nichols, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and
Director of Clinical Experiences
College of Education
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, AL 36265

Paper Presented at the MSERA Annual Meetng,
Biloxi, MS, November 9, 1995

Calls for better collaborative efforts between universities and schools have become urgent among university leaders. Smith (1992) presented 38 award winning collaborative efforts from 1977-1989 that revealed 30 of these collaborative efforts involved projects that were designed to support university preservice teacher education programs. These efforts were aimed at solving university needs. Auger & Odell (1992) presented three nationally recognized collaborative efforts between the University of New Mexico and Albuquerque Public Schools. Again, the focus of the collaborative efforts was to enhance the preparation of teacher education students. Brown (1992) and Berg & Murphy (1992) further focused on improving teacher education through collaborative efforts with classroom teachers. Harris & Harris (1993) actually labeled partner schools as "places to solve teacher education problems". Zimpher (1990) outlined the history of university "exploitation" of schools for the purpose of research and teacher education.

According to Rafferty (1994), challenges to real collaborative inquiry (research) involve the cultural differences between schools and universities. She noted that universities are in the business of producing knowledge while schools are expected to use knowledge. In support of Rafferty's view, Atkin (1992) claimed that school-based knowledge was undervalued since research was the province of university professors. Atkin boldly stated that teacher initiated action research, to be successful,

must occur outside of the university's control. The ability of classroom teachers to engage in their own action research projects may be most questionable in small rural school districts where lack of funding and isolation further complicate the differences in research purpose and expertise between university personnel and teachers (Kern, et al., 1991).

Some literature presents comprehensive approaches, methods and apparent solutions to practitioner action research problems and issues (Anderson, et al., 1994; Calhoun, 1994). In Georgia, a League of Professional Schools has approached action research on students and school culture on a cooperative basis involving over 40 schools and the University of Georgia (Calhoun and Allen, 1994). Changes in student behavior and achievement, new experiences for students, and increased communication within many of the schools have been the implications of action research. Calhoun and Glickman (1993) argued that both process and product outcomes were enhanced for students and teachers by League collaborative efforts.

In a planned effort to enhance school-university partnerships, the University of Indiana and 10 professional development schools have developed "collaborative inquiry" principles that includes attention to action research processes (Rafferty, 1994). Romance and Vitale (1993) chronicled a multi-year collaborative action research project between classroom teachers and university professors in a large urban school

district. The authors claimed that both a teacher-mentor model and a set of requirements for establishing classroom teacher capability to conduct research had the potential to "empower" teachers to take action to improve their schools. Another model, the Academic Challenge Program, purported to facilitate collaborative action research to close the gap between theory/research and practice (Berlin and White, 1993). A specific program objective was to provide classroom teachers with the background needed to conduct classroom-based research. Stepans (1992) outlined another model to enhance the classroom teacher's abilities to do classroom action research. In this model, a university "facilitator" and six inservice sessions prepared teachers to conduct their own science-related research.

Recent calls for collaborative efforts, therefore, appear to be aimed at colleges doing a better job of supporting school improvement efforts. Herrick (1992) proposed a model for collaborative action research as a means to gain meaningful improvements in schools. Herrick maintained that researchable problems are best identified in schools, best conducted by practitioners, and leads to school improvement. Knight, Wiseman, & Smith (1992) presented three partnerships that focused on school/university renewal that expanded past preservice teacher education needs to include action research projects aimed at school renewal and to provide support for problem solving in the area schools. Jacullo-Noto (1992) presented a model for school

and university partnerships focused on local administrator and teacher development and school improvement. Calhoun (1993) argued for three types of action research to strengthen school personnel abilities to study schoolwide problems and issues. The three types were individual teacher research, collaborative action research and schoolwide action research. Sagor (1993), through Project LEARN (League of Educational Action Researchers in the Northwest), developed a model for university support and training of local administrators and teachers in the use of collaborative action research to improve teaching and learning conditions in their schools and classrooms.

The Research Purpose and Design

The research and follow-up discussed in this paper were guided by the school improvement literature and particularly followed the model for collaborative action research outlined by Sagor. The project responds to the current calls for collaborative efforts between schools and colleges.

This project was an effort to respond to the identified needs at a small city high school in the school's efforts to improve relations among parents, teachers, and 750 students. Two educational administration professors worked collaboratively with the high school principal, assistant principal, and two counselors in an action research project that consisted of developing, administering, and analyzing data from perception survey instruments that were anticipated to provide

recommendations for action plans for school improvement. The project's objectives were to:

1. Involve the administration, faculty, parents, and students of an area school in the process of action research through a collaborative effort with university professors.
2. Determine faculty, parents, and student perceptions of climate for students in advance and standard diploma programs.
3. Determine the faculty perceptions of school climate for emotionally conflicted students.
4. Determine faculty and parent perceptions of the educational needs of seventh and eighth grade students.
5. Assist school administrators to become more confident in designing, implementing, interpreting, and reporting action research.

A five step action research process was used in the project as follows: 1) problem formulation, 2) data collection through survey instruments, 3) data analysis and interpretation, 4) reporting the findings, and 5) action planning for school improvement.

The problem formulation step involved brainstorming sessions in the summer and early fall of 1993 with the principal, assistant principal, and counselors to address problems they have identified through a performance based accreditation procedure

mandated by the state department of education. This step indicated that the following problems should be investigated: 1) school climate for students in advance and standard diploma programs, 2) school climate for emotionally conflicted students, and 3) unmet educational needs of seventh and eighth grade students in the school.

The data collection involved faculty, parent and student perceptions through survey instruments designed by the university professors after several consultations with the school's administrators and counselors. Four perceptual response instruments were developed: two for two parent groups, one for teachers, and one for students in grades 9-12. The instruments were piloted in a neighboring high school in November, 1993. The teacher instrument was administered by the researchers during an after school meeting in the high school library in mid-January, 1994. The next morning, homeroom teachers administered the student instrument to the students during the homeroom period. Parent instruments were mailed to the households of students in grades 7 and 8 and 9-12 at the same time. The data analysis and interpretation step included the application of descriptive statistics, mainly measures of central tendency, and a oneway analysis of variance. The remaining two steps are reported throughout the remainder of this paper.

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The high school had two academic levels for students: advance diploma and standard diploma. Generally, advance diploma students took more rigorous courses, including advanced placement or honors courses, while standard diploma students took less rigorous courses and were often found in the vocational education curriculum. Yet both diploma level students could be in the same courses, subject to the same performance standards and eligible for "honors" student designation by achieving an 85 percent average in coursework. Of the 378 grades 9-12 students who completed the perceptual questionnaire, 65 percent were advance diploma and 35 percent standard diploma. The number of students completing the questionnaire was 89 percent of the entire student body grades 9-12. Seventh and eighth grades students did not complete a questionnaire. Human subjects research restrictions would have required additional assurances paperwork for younger subjects.

Parent characteristics indicated that mothers were most likely to complete the perceptual questionnaire. For the 18 question seventh and eighth grades parent questionnaire, mothers completed 80 percent of the questionnaires while fathers completed 20 percent. For the 32 question grades 9-12 parent questionnaire, mothers completed 77 percent of the questionnaires and fathers 20 percent. About 69 percent of the grades 9-12 parent respondents were parents of advance diploma students, 20

percent identified themselves as parents of standard diploma students, and 11 percent did not designate either diploma. A total of 265 parents returned completed questionnaires. Of this number, 157 were parents of students in grades 9-12 and 108 were parents of students in grades 7 and 8.

The 43 teacher respondents were 27 women (63 percent) and 16 men (37 percent). They completed three perceptual questionnaires: a 27 question instrument on advance and standard diploma students, the 18 question seventh and eighth grades questionnaire, and a 21 question instrument on emotionally conflicted and disruptive students. Approximately 56 percent currently taught seventh and eighth graders while 44 percent did not. Of the latter group, 16 percent or seven teachers indicated they had never taught seventh and eighth graders. All but five of the teachers were regular education. Only 28 percent or 12 teachers had 10 or fewer years of teaching experience, 37 percent had 11 to 20 years, and 35 percent had 21 years or more. Just three teachers on the entire staff had three or fewer years of experience.

Data Analysis and Findings

A Likert-type rating scale was used in the questionnaires. A typical question on the parent and teacher advance and standard diploma student questionnaires was the following:

> Teachers are more likely to read and comment on advance diploma students' written work than standard diploma students' work.
> _____Strongly agree _____Agree _____Not Sure
> _____Disagree _____Strongly disagree

This question also was on the questionnaires the grades 9-12 students completed. A point value of 5 was designated for "strongly agree" and a point value of 1 was designated for "strongly disagree" while a 3 was designated for "not sure". Therefore, a mean response of over 3.00 for a question indicated the respondents agreed with it and a mean response of under 3.00 indicated the respondents disagreed with it. The advance and standard diploma questionnaire was similar for the teacher, student, and 9-12 grades parent respondents. The teachers and parents of seventh and eighth grade students completed the same 18 question perceptual instrument. Only the teachers completed the questionnaire concerning emotionally conflicted and disruptive students.

The hundreds of descriptive findings tended to show that teachers' perceptions differed, sometimes substantially, with those of students and parents. Hence, the school's climate was implicated by the many discrepancies. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) findings further substantiated the differing perceptions among respondent groups. There were well over 100 significant differences in the means of the respondent groups out of nearly 650 ANOVA analyses.

The host of student and parent written comments on the questionnaires reflected much ambivalence over the issues presented in the questionnaires. Some pointed remarks challenged the teachers and the school to be more responsive to student needs in curriculum as well as attitudes toward students and in

teaching techniques. There appeared to be fewer concerns here over disruptive or unmotivated students and unsupportive parents compared to the teachers' questionnaire responses.

The School's Initial Follow-up to the Research Findings

On August 15, 1994, the teachers had their opening inservice day for the 1994-95 school year. In July, the principal and assistant principal met with the two university professors to review and discuss the analytical findings and plan for the August inservice day. The assistant principal agreed to present the descriptive findings via overhead transparencies to the teachers. Basically, he would present selected means from the teacher questionnaire, student questionnaire, and the grades 9-12 parent questionnaire. He would show comparisons among the means for these groups. The purpose would be to simply present the findings to the teachers without further discussion.

One of the professors met with the assistant principal at the end of July to review the inservice day strategy and provide advice. The assistant principal had his 30-40 minutes presentation video taped on inservice day. The principal distributed all the written comments from the students, parents, and teachers themselves. No discussion of the comments occurred.

Further Follow-up

On October 10, 1994, the teachers used a second inservice day to discuss the implications of the descriptive and inferential statistical findings in small groups. The principal chose eight staff members to be the small focus group leaders

after a meeting with the university professors to plan the next inservice day in late September. The next step was for the university professors to meet with the focus group leaders a week before the October inservice day. The professors prepared focus group leader packets. In the packets were the following contents.

Demographics of Students
Teacher and Parent Characteristics and ANOVA
Analysis of Means for AD and SD Students
Analysis of Means for EC and Disruptive Students
Summary Tables for Teachers, Parents, and Students Surveys
Summary Tables for Teacher Experience Levels
Analysis of Means of 7th and 8th Grades Teacher/Parent Surveys
.05 and .10 ANOVA Findings--Teachers Survey
.05 and .10 ANOVA Findings--Parents Survey
.05 and .10 ANOVA Findings--Students Survey
Blank Survey Forms

The packets were distributed to the focus group leaders and the contents were reviewed. The leaders were advised to select a few of the findings, including the written comments, and ask their small group members to react to each finding and suggest any follow-up the staff could take regarding each finding. The professors gave the leaders worksheets they could use for this purpose and two examples of how the worksheets could be used (see appendix). Further, the professors distributed and discussed "small group activity procedures" and "rules for brainstorming".

In the morning of the second inservice day, the professors delivered a twenty minutes introduction to the entire staff bridging the August 15 inservice day with this inservice day. They briefly reviewed the standards for an effective school and an improving school and how the perceptual survey instruments

reflected issues related to effective schools and improving schools. The staff members each received a packet of research material that included hard copies of the descriptive findings presented at the September inservice day meeting, demographic information on the respondent groups, an explanation of the ANOVA technique with examples and a clean copy of the three-part questionnaire they each completed last January.

The eight small focus groups had from four to six participants and met in separate rooms throughout the school for at least one hour during the morning. At the conclusion of their meetings, the focus group leaders turned in the worksheets to the professors and principal. Over the noon hour, the small focus group meetings results were compiled, edited and grouped by the professors and principal (with the superintendent looking on).

After lunch the entire staff met in the school's library with the professors, principal, and assistant principal to hear and discuss the results of the small focus group meetings. Some 35 suggestions for improving teacher-student-parent communications and relationships were reported back to the staff. The principal and assistant principal commented on how informative the research had been for their practice as administrators and that they obtained further insights on faculty thinking regarding school climate improvement issues. One of the professors concluded the inservice activity by congratulating the staff on using perceptual survey research findings to help them

determine ways their teaching and, ultimately, the school could continue to improve.

The School's Lack of Effort in Action Planning

A most critical point in a collaborative action research project is the action to be taken as a result of the research findings and conclusions. That point was reached after the October 10 inservice day. In addition to the issues of differing purposes among the collaborators and the shift of project ownership to the school's staff, the enthusiasm to keep moving ahead was likely to wane for one or both parties to the collaboration (Cohen and Manion, 1994; Calhoun, 1994; and Bickel and Hattrup, 1995).

The professors perceived that any planning for action by the school's staff in light of the concerns identified during the October inservice day had not taken place in the succeeding weeks. While several reasons may have contributed to the apparent lethargy, the essential one appeared to be the lack of ownership by the staff, students and parents in the project. The school's administrators or counselors had not pursued any action of their own or asked the staff to take hold of the project and plan for action.

Energizing the Action Effort, Involving Students

In late November, the professors contacted the school's principal and suggested that a meeting occur between the professors and the eight faculty focus group leaders to identify those teacher and student survey questions that analysis showed

were concerns and, also, were of interest to the teachers. The professors indicated that the questions should then be presented to small student focus groups composed of eleventh and twelfth grades advanced and standard diploma students for discussion and their suggestions. The two professors offered to chair the student focus groups to encourage openness and discussion by the students. The principal agreed, and a meeting was arranged in early December between the professors and the faculty focus group leaders.

The professors asked the faculty focus group leaders to each submit four or five questions that they thought were important for the students to address based on the analytical findings for these questions. The leaders agreed to submit the questions to the principal in a week's time. The principal then sent the questions to the professors. Upon receipt of the questions from the principal, the professors collated and compared the questions. The result was the identification of eight questions the professors would discuss with the students.

In early January, the professors contacted the principal to inform him of the recommended questions for the small student focus groups. The principal and professors then finalized the dates and times for the student focus groups to meet before the end of the month. The professors met with four student focus groups, two advanced and two standard diploma, composed of 8-10 counselor and administrator selected students. The one hour

meetings occurred virtually on the anniversary of the completion of the survey questionnaire by the school's students.

Jumping Off Point for Action Planning: The Issues Report

The professors analyzed the students' responses to the questions. Then they prepared a report titled "A Synthesis of Teacher and Student Perceptions at JHS Resulting from Focus Group Interaction During 1994-95" that they shared with the administrators and counselors in February (1995). The report opened with the following statements.

> ... the two-tier diploma system is controversial at the school. Some students argued to eliminate the two diploma categories while others wanted to keep them. Generally, advanced diploma (AD) students wanted to keep the two categories and standard diploma (SD) students wanted every student to be treated the same. In any case, if the two diploma categories are retained, the students urged that AD and SD students not be mixed in classes. They believed that neither category of students benefitted from such a situation and teachers faced the dilemma of differential expectations for students in the same class.

With this challenging opening written, the professors then went on to identify 14 issues or concerns that came out of the teacher and student focus group meetings. The professors realized that the school's staff had not yet taken control or ownership of the action research project. So they wrote in the report the following sentence.

> To move the action research process along to a more active mode, suggestions or recommendations for action are stated at the conclusion of each issue/concern section.

The 14 issues/concerns (along with accompanying suggestions/ recommendations) were:

Inservice/Staff Development for Teachers
Homework

In Class Participation
Teacher Expectations for Students
Respect(for students)
Scheduling of Classes
Administrative Monitoring of Classrooms
Teaching Techniques
Helping/Encouraging Students
Disruption in Class
Discipline (punishment)
College Preparation (advisement for)
SD Employment Opportunities
Weighted Grades

In early March (1995), the professors met with the school's staff during a faculty meeting to share "highlights" of the report. The issues/concerns and suggestions/recommendations were quickly presented during the meeting by the professors. Each school staff member got a copy of the report to read more carefully later. The principal reiterated to the staff his support for the action research project and stated that the report was what he really wanted out of the project (the numerous quantitative analyses did not mean as much to him).

Informing the Parents: The Newsletter

While waiting for the school's staff to respond in some way to the report, the professors prepared text copy on the findings of the research project for a school newsletter to parents. The results of the parents' survey questionnaire responses were emphasized for the newsletter. The school did not have a parent or community newsletter. The research project, then, gave impetus for this long overdue communication with parents and the larger community.

The Professors' Final Push: The Action Planning Timeline Spreadsheet

As the 1994-95 school year drew to a close, the school's staff had not yet responded to the report with any action plans. Therefore, the professors developed a spreadsheet that had a column for the issues, a resources needed column, and a third column for the activities to be undertaken to address the issues. Following the three columns was a timeline divided into months beginning with August, 1995 and ending with July, 1997. The issues to be addressed were to be fitted into the timeline over a two-year period.

The professors contacted the school's principal in late April (1995) and asked that a meeting with the teacher focus group leaders be arranged as soon as possible to discuss the spreadsheet. The principal agreed and he, the focus group leaders and the professors met at the school in early May. At that time, with the principal's strong urging, the focus group leaders agreed to address the issues by prioritizing them in terms of immediate action and longer-term action. They agreed to use the spreadsheet as presented by the professors. Further, they agreed to respond with an initial action plan within ten days. Finally, it appeared, the school's staff was about to take ownership of the action research project nearly two years after it was conceived in the summer of 1993.

Follow-up to the Spreadsheet Meeting

When the principal and focus group leaders met again, they did so without the two professors (for the first time). They agreed on an action plan that would begin in August when the school's staff returned for the 1995-96 school year.

The action plan emphasized some immediate activities to include a panel of teachers who will inform other teachers on how to help students develop and practice study skills. The panel would also review the issues of homework that students raised in their questionnaire responses and small focus groups. The panel's efforts will begin in mid-August when the school's staff returns for the 1995-96 school year.

Still other short-term activities were planned. The effective schools literature would be revisted in the fall. As requested by the students, more administrative visits to classrooms to monitor instructional practices would occur. Faculty input through a survey questionnaire on discipline will be obtained at the start of the school year. Discipline concerns to be addressed were the expectations teachers have for classroom discipline, parent involvement in discipline, staff development on discipline techniques, the establishment of a student and teacher panel on discipline in the school and a task force to study inschool suspension. Industrial managers and owners of area businesses will be asked to explain to teachers what employers expect of the school's graduates on the job. Further,

teacher visits to area businesses would be arranged later in the school year.

The longest-range action step planned involved the continuing study of block scheduling with implementation projected for the fall of 1996. In their report, the professors suggested that block scheduling could help in ameliorating a number of the issues. These issues included teacher expectations for students, adult respect for students, updating teaching techniques, helping/encouraging students, classroom disruptions and discipline.

The School's Ten-Year Self Study

One of the more immediate uses of this collaborative action research effort was the incorporation of selected findings in the high school's ten-year self study in October, 1995. The self study was in preparation for the visiting committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Reference was made to perceptual climate research in several places in the self study report, such as in the EVALUATION AND RESEARCH subsection of Section 9: SCHOOL STAFF AND ADMINISTRATION.

The Section 9 committee was chaired by the high school's principal, and six teachers were on the committee. This group reported in writing that the results of a "perception survey" were reviewed with the school's faculty during two inservice days and "follow-up activities will be initiated to bring about improvement in the areas noted."

The most use of the collaborative action research occurred in the SCHOOL CLIMATE subsection of Section 2: SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY. Here the committee composed of the assistant principal and nine teachers explained the procedures involved in administering a "student opinion survey" one day in January, 1994. This committee broadly concluded that the "perception of the students is that the climate is favorable to the learning process" and over generalized that students were "pleased with their teachers, the curriculum, and extracurricular activities offered" in the school. In answer to the question concerning the significant findings of the survey, five well selected positive conclusions were stated. Implications were that "students are pleased with the curriculum offered and the way their teachers work with them" and students surmise that the school "offers a quality education for all students."

Equally glowing were the discussions for faculty and community perceptions. The committee concluded that "there were no significant differences in perceptions between students, teachers and community (parents)." In the end, the committee hedged somewhat by writing that parents who responded (about 34 percent) thought the school was doing an acceptable job and that a "majority" of the students believed the school provided "a proper learning environment with a good curriculum." Finally, a "majority" of teachers "enjoyed their profession and their students."

This use of the research data came close to the old propaganda technique of "card stacking" the evidence to serve a specific purpose or cause. While not quite a "white wash" of what all the data revealed, the school's staff clearly used this collaborative action research to make the school look good to the visiting committee and other readers of the self study. Ignored were the many perceptual differences between students and teachers, teachers and parents, and between students themselves. The result here may indeed be a strong (not necessarily good) example of local school control of the collaborative action research process and outcomes interpretation.

Anticipated Future Role of the University

According to the principal, cooperative efforts with the university would continue for the purpose of addressing some of the issues. These issues included providing for staff development activities on teaching techniques, strategies for teachers in dealing with classroom disruptions and assisting in the preparation of grant applications. Basically, however, the action plan emphasized the school staff's own efforts in addressing the issues.

The Professors' Revised Role

The professors have not been asked to do any more on the action research project as of the writing of this paper. The professors do not intend to offer any more assistance. They have determined that the school's staff should now take responsibility (and ownership) of the project after nearly two years of

nurturing and gradual shifting of control away from the professors. Bickel and Hattrup (1995) contended that both parties in a teacher-researcher collaboration need to be committed to the partnership. Aside from the principal, it was not always certain in this case that such dual commitment existed. Bickel and Hattrup further argued that "meaningful collaboration" took time to unfold. Since collaboration tends to wane after the initial novelty of and excitement about the partnership, sustaining the collaboration after it has operated for a while is difficult for both parties. Other problems and projects get in the way over time, and any particular collaboration becomes less of a priority. The two professors in this reported collaborative action research project can attest to the difficulty.

The professors' closing remarks to the principal and the faculty focus group leaders included their willingness to be of assistance in implementing the action plans at the school staff's request. The professors now await further communication from a representative of the staff or the principal.

Conclusion

This paper has reported a school-university collaborative action research effort augmented and facilitated by two educational administration professors. The university's services, in this case, were used to assist a school's staff members to do what they thought was important. Instead of a school, its staff and students making themselves available for a

university inspired (owned) research project, university professors and resources were used to help a school do its own research and take action to improve itself in accordance with its needs and priorities. This new found role for a university, especially its College of Education, despite the difficulty, has the potential to make a university and its professors more relevant and useful partners to schools interested in improving climate, curriculum, instruction, and communications with parents and students. However, as the high school's self study report showed, useful and relevant can be quite self serving, and university professors may need to be wary of how they and their work in schools may be manipulated when control shifts to the local school's staff.

References

Anderson, G.L., et al. (1994). Studying your own school: An educator's guide to qualitative practitioner research. Corwin Press: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Atkins, J. M. (1992). Teaching as research: An essay. TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION 8 (4), 381-390.

Auger, F.K., & Odell, S.J. (1992). Three school-university partnerships for teacher development. JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION 43(4), 262-268.

Berg, M., & Murphy, D.S. (1992). Can we mass produce a college/school partnership fcr professional practice? ACTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION 14(1), 57-61.

Berlin, D. F., and White, A.F. (1993). Teachers as researchers: Implementation and evaluation of an action research model. COGNOSOS: THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR SCIENCE TEACHING AND LEARNING RESEARCH QUARTERLY 2 (2), 1-3.

Bickel, W.E., and Hattrup, R.A. (1995). Teachers and researchers in collaboration: Reflections on the process. AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL 32(1), 35-62.

Brown, C.S. (1992). Classroom teachers as teacher educators: Towards building collaborative linkages. ACTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION 14(2), 30-37.

Calhoun, E.F. (1993). Action research: Three approaches. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, 51 (2), 62-69.

Calhoun, E.F. (1994). How to use action research in the self-renewing school. ASCD: Alexandria, VA.

Calhoun, E.F. & Allen, L. (1994). Results of schoolwide action research in the League of Professional Schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 327)

Cohen, L., and Manion, L. (1994). Research methods in education, fourth ed., chapter 9. Routledge: New York.

Harris, R.C., and Harris, M.F. (1993). Partner schools: Places to solve teacher preparation problems. ACTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION 14(4), 1-8.

Heikkinen, H.W., McDevitt, T.M., & Stone, B.J. (1992). Classroom teachers as agents of reform in university teacher preparation programs. JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION 43(4), 283-289.

Herrick, M.J. (1992). Research by the teacher and for the teacher: An action research model linking schools and universities. ACTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION 14(3), 47-54.

Jacullo-Nato, J. (1992). An urban school/liberal arts college partnership for teacher development. JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION 43(4), 278-281.

Kern, S. J., et al. (1991). Rural educators helping themselves as teacher researchers. In Reaching our potential: Rural education in the 90's. CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS. Rural Education Symposium: Nashville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 342 528)

Knight, S.L., Wiseman, D., & Smith, C.W. (1992). The reflectivity-activity dilemma in school-university partnerships. JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION 43(4), 269-277.

Rafferty, C. D. (1994). Promoting multi-site collaborative inquiry: Initial efforts and challenges. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American educational research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 369 320)

Romance, N. & Vitale, M.R. (1993). Evolution of a 5-year action research project: Results and implications for empowering school improvement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365 643)

Sagor, R. (1993). How to conduct collaborative action research. ASCD: Alexandria, VA.

Smith, S.D. (1992). Professional partnerships and educational change: effective collaboration over time. JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION 43(4), 243-256.

Stepans, J., et al. (1992). Teacher, administrator and university educator form a triad. JOURNAL OF RURAL AND SMALL SCHOOLS 5 (2), 38-41.

Ten-year self study. (1995). Jacksonville High School: Jacksonville, AL.

Zimpher, N. (1990). Creating professional development school sites. THEORY INTO PRACTICE 29(1), 42-49.

APPENDIX

FOCUS GROUP WORKSHEET

FINDINGS/RESULTS	FOCUS GROUP RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP
1. Teachers at this high school do not respect Standard Diploma students as much as Advanced Diploma students. T = 2.72 S = 2.81 P = 2.47 (All groups disagree)	1. Agree	1. Continue to emphasize respect for all students. Staff Development Implications: 1) Resource persons a. Learning Styles b. Personality Types c. TQM 2) Conferencing with students 3) Small Focus Groups of students/teachers to discuss climate 4) Review Effective Schools Correlates
2. Flexible scheduling is best for students in grades 7 & 8. < 10 yrs exp 2.50 11-20 yrs exp 3.53 21 + yrs exp 3.40 Significance .01	2. Ambivalent	2. Research more information about flexible scheduling. 1) Discuss literature at depth at faculty meetings 2) Resource persons 3) Small Focus Groups to discuss/clarify issue 4) Pilot Flexible Scheduling on a limited basis

FOCUS GROUP WORKSHEET

FINDINGS/RESULTS	FOCUS GROUP RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP